UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

	United States of America	ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL
	V. CHARLES HATHORN Defendant	Case No. 1:14-CR-175-RJJ-2
	ter conducting a detention hearing under the Bail Reform Act, fendant be detained pending trial.	18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), I conclude that these facts require
	Part I – Findings o	of Fact
` , ,	The defendant is charged with an offense described in 18 U.S a federal offense a state or local offense that woul existed – that is	
-	a crime of violence as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 3156(a)(4 which the prison term is 10 years or more.), or an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332b(g)(5)(B) for
-	an offense for which the maximum sentence is death or	life imprisonment.
-	an offense for which a maximum prison term of ten yea	rs or more is prescribed in:
-	a felony committed after the defendant had been convidues. U.S.C. § 3142(f)(1)(A)-(C), or comparable state or local	cted of two or more prior federal offenses described in 18 offenses.
-	any felony that is not a crime of violence but involves: a minor victim	
	the possession or use of a firearm or destruction a failure to register under 18 U.S.C. § 2250	uctive device or any other dangerous weapon
	The offense described in finding (1) was committed while the or local offense.	defendant was on release pending trial for a federal, state
	A period of less than 5 years has elapsed since the date offense described in finding (1).	of conviction defendant's release from prison for the
	Findings (1), (2) and (3) establish a rebuttable presumption th person or the community. I further find that defendant has no	
	Alternative Findin	gs (A)
√ (1)	There is probable cause to believe that the defendant has cor	nmitted an offense
-	for which a maximum prison term of ten years or more in Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) under 18 U.S.C. § 924(c).	s prescribed in:
	under 16 0.3.6. § 924(c). The defendant has not rebutted the presumption established will reasonably assure the defendant's appearance and the sa	
	Alternative Findin There is a serious risk that the defendant will not appear.	

- ✓ (2) There is a serious risk that the defendant will endanger the safety of another person or the community.

Part II – Statement of the Reasons for Detention

I find that the testimony and information submitted at the detention hearing establishes by

clear and convincing evidence a preponderance of the evidence that:

Defendant rebutted the statutory presumption with respect to serious risk of non-appearance, and the government has not met its burden of preponderant evidence that defendant poses a serious risk of non-appearance. Defendant has failed to rebut the presumption regarding dangerousness. Moreover, the government has proffered clear and convincing evidence that defendant poses a danger to the community. This includes prior convictions for drug trafficking, including delivery/manufacture of 1,000 or more grams for which he was discharged from parole on April 6, 2014. The evidence also includes defendant's reckless conduct in attempting to flee from law enforcement, which endangered the public as well as law enforcement officers.

Part III - Directions Regarding Detention

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or a designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or held in custody pending appeal. The defendant must be afforded a reasonable opportunity to consult privately with defense counsel. On order of United States Court or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility must deliver the defendant to the United States marshal for a court appearance.

Date: _	December 9, 2014	Judge's Signature:	/s/ Phillip J. Green	
		Name and Title:	Phillip J. Green, U.S. Magistrate Judge	